

1 LAURA GENS
 2 4141 Old Trace Road
 3 Palo Alto, CA 94306
 Telephone: (650) 949-4880
 Facsimile: (650) 949-4889

4 In Pro Per

Filed
 JAN 18 2013
 RICHARD W. WIEKING
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE

5
 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 8 SAN JOSE DIVISION

9 LAURA GENS,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CAL-WESTERN RECONVEYANCE
 CORPORATION, and WELLS FARGO,

13 Defendants.
 14
 15
 16

CASE NO. 5:12-CV-05947 EJD

Date of Hearing: March 29, 2013

Time of Hearing: 9:00 pm

Courtroom:

**MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO
 DEFENDANTS MOTION TO DISMISS**

17
 18 **I. INTRODUCTION**

19 Plaintiff does not waive any rights to remand this case to state court as requested in her
 20 motion to remand currently pending. Nor does plaintiff waive any rights afforded her under 28
 21 U.S.C. §362.

22 Plaintiff has never sued these defendants in this Court. This case was removed by
 23 defendants from state court. Plaintiff prepared and filed a skeleton complaint in state court
 24 expecting to file a much more comprehensive, amended complaint. Defendants removed this
 25 case and within a few days filed a motion to dismiss. With the filing of this opposition, plaintiff
 26 moved this court for the right to file an amended complaint.
 27
 28

II. LEGAL ARGUMENTS

A. Plaintiff's First Cause of Action.

Contrary to defendant's unsubstantiated statements, plaintiff has shown in the complaint that the July 11, 2012 Notice of Trustee's Sale does not conform to statutory standards. If allowed, plaintiff can plead further detail about the violations of Cal.Civ.Code §2924(g) by defendants.

Given an opportunity, plaintiff can plead that plaintiff did tender the entire amount owed with not one, but two different lenders. The tender was made prior to the date of the Notice of Default. The facts plead also will pierce the privilege otherwise afforded under Civil Code §§ 47 and 2924(d) that the defendants acted maliciously when enforcing its security interest.

This claim clearly does not duplicate any prior claims in substance or form.

B. Plaintiff's Second Cause of Action.

Plaintiff can plead that plaintiff did tender the entire amount owed with not one, but two different lenders. The tender was made prior to the date of the Notice of Default.

This claim does not duplicate any prior claims in form or substance.

C. Plaintiff's Third Cause of Action.

Plaintiff can plead that plaintiff did tender the entire amount owed with not one, but two different lenders. The tender was made prior to the date of the Notice of Default.

This claim does not duplicate any prior claims in form or substance.

D. Plaintiff's Causes of Action are Not Preempted by the Home Owner's Loan Act (HOLA).

Plaintiff can plead that plaintiff's claims are not preempted by HOLA as this was not necessary in state court. The facts will show both that the defendants actions do not fall under the provisions of 12 C.F.R. §560.2 (b) as mere "processing" or "servicing". Furthermore, other facts will demonstrate a vital state court claim through a vital Truth In Lending Act claim.

1 Again, this claim does not duplicate any prior claims in substance or form.
2

3 **III. CONCLUSION**

4 This Court should deny the motion to dismiss and allow plaintiff the opportunity to amend
5 the complaint which she was denied when this case was removed to federal court and the filing by
6 defendants' of a motion to dismiss as a quickly-filed, first pleading. Should the Court otherwise
7 be inclined to grant Defendants' motions, Plaintiff requests the opportunity to amend the
8 complaint.

9 This opposition is being filed with the clerk's office and served to defendants through the ECF.

10 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that all of the
11 statements made in this Opposition are true and correct. Executed at Palo Alto, CA.

12 Dated: January 17, 2013
13



14
15 Laura Gens
16 Plaintiff
17 In Pro Per
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28